

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

A "Replacement Sheet" is attached which include a clean version of amended Fig. 1. The attached sheet replaces the original sheet including Fig. 1.

An "Annotated Sheet Showing Changes" is also attached which includes a marked-up version of Fig. 1.

Attachments: Replacement sheet

Annotated sheet showing changes

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-7 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. As a result, claims 1-7 are pending for examination with claims 1 and 5 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Applicants note that the preliminary amendment filed on May 13, 2005 includes various amendments to the claims.

Objections to the Drawings

The Office Action objected to Figure 1 of the drawings noting that Figure 1 should be designated by a legend such as -- Prior Art --. Applicants have herein amended Figure 1 to add the legend --Prior Art--. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Specification

The Office Action objected to the specification and offered a list of guidelines illustrating the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. Applicants would like to bring to the Examiner's attention the preliminary amendment filed on May 13, 2005 in which changes similar to those suggested by the Examiner were made to the application. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Office Action states that in claim 1, it is not clear what is meant by a message associated with "a specific event from among second specific events." Per the Examiner's suggestion, the word "among" has been deleted. Claim 1 also has been amended to be clear that it is the second events which are independent from the execution of the instruction sequence by the microprocessor.

The Office Action states that it is not clear which type of event is referred to by “said specific event” in claim 1. Claim 1, line 10 has been amended to be clear that the signal of characteristic data that is being transmitted is associated with the specific event from the second specific events.

The Office Action states that the final lines of claim 5 is not understandable because of the use of the word “from”. Claim 5, lines 16 has been amended to recite transmitting a digital message representative of the stored characteristic data signal.

Based at least on the above amendments, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,070,210 to Cheon (hereinafter, “Cheon”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 1 is directed to a method including transmitting a request signal to a monitoring circuit and transmitting messages from a monitoring circuit. Claim 5 recites a monitoring circuit. Cheon describes a direct memory access system having a direct memory access device (DMA device). The DMA device is not a monitoring circuit. A monitoring circuit is capable of reading specific data provided by a microprocessor upon execution of program, and the DMA device of Cheon only executes read/write operations in a memory. For at least this reason, the rejection of claims 1 and 5 is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

To clarify the operation of the monitoring circuit, claim 1 has been amended to recite transmitting digital messages to an analysis tool through output terminals of a monitoring circuit. Cheon does not teach or suggest transmitting messages from a monitoring circuit to an analysis tool. In the Office Action, the DMA of Cheon is pointed to as being a monitoring circuit and the CPU is pointed to as being an analysis tool (see p. 6, lines 23 – p. 7, line 1 of the Office Action). As stated in column 1, lines 24-30 of Cheon, in a DMA transmission system, data is directly transmitted between a main memory and an input/output device without passing through a CPU. Accordingly, even if the DMA device of Cheon is considered to be a monitoring circuit and the CPU of Cheon is considered to be an analysis tool, Cheon does not teach or suggest transmitting

messages from the DMA device to the CPU. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claims 1 and 5 is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

Claim 1 recites transmitting digital messages which are representative of first specific events, the first specific events depending on the execution of an instruction sequence by a microprocessor. Claim 5 recites means for transmitting first digital messages being representative of first specific events which depend on the execution of an instruction sequence by a microprocessor. The Office Action contends that data transmitted through the DATA port of DMA device (100) in Cheon is representative of first specific events which depend on the execution of an instruction sequence by the microprocessor, and states that the event is the event for writing to memory (110). Applicants disagree. For the digital message to be representative of a first specific event, some content of the digital message needs to depend on the first specific event. For example, the digital message may include an identifier indicating that the message is related to the occurrence of an event that is linked to the execution of a program by the microprocessor. The data transferred between memory (110) and SCSI controller (120) in Cheon is not representative of the type of event that has occurred, that is, the transferred data of Cheon does not distinguish between an event that does depend on the execution of an instruction sequence by a microprocessor and an event that does not depend on such an execution. For at least this additional reason, the rejection of claims 1 and 5 is respectfully requested to be withdrawn.

As amended, claim 1 recites transmitting a digital message representative of a stored characteristic data signal to an analysis tool, and claim 5 recites means for transmitting a digital message representative of a stored characteristic data signal to an analysis tool. Without conceding that a characteristic data signal is stored by the DMA device in Cheon, the DMA device does not transmit a characteristic data signal to an analysis tool. As shown in Figure 2 of Cheon, the DATA port is connected only to the memory (110) and the SCSI controller (120), and not to the CPU which is considered to be an analysis tool in the Office Action (see p. 6, lines 23 - p. 7, line 1 of the Office Action). Additionally, as discussed above, Cheon states that in a DMA system, data is directly transmitted between a main memory and an input/output device without passing through a CPU. Accordingly, Cheon does not teach or suggest transmitting a characteristic data signal to an analysis tool, and the rejection of independent claims 1 and 5 is respectfully requested to be withdrawn for at least this additional reason.

Each of claims 2-4 and 6-7 depends directly from claims 1 and 5, respectively, and withdrawal of the rejections of these claims is respectfully requested for at least the same reasons provided above for claims 1 and 5.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if this communication does not place the case in condition for allowance.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to deposit account no. 23/2825.

Dated: January 12, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Eric L. Amundsen, Reg. No.: 46,518
WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.
Federal Reserve Plaza
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206
(617) 646-8000

xx01/12/07xx